

Christopher R. Harris
Thomas J. Giblin
LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
1271 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020
Telephone: (212) 906-1200
Facsimile: (212) 751-4864

Attorneys for IOM Nominees

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION
CORPORATION,

Plaintiff-Applicant,

v.

BERNARD L. MADOFF INVESTMENT
SECURITIES LLC,

Defendant.

In re:

BERNARD L. MADOFF,

Debtor.

IRVING H. PICARD, Trustee for the
Substantively Consolidated SIPA Liquidation
of Bernard L. Madoff Investment Securities
LLC and the Chapter 7 Estate of Bernard L.
Madoff,

Plaintiff,

v.

ABN AMRO RETAINED NOMINEES (IOM)
LIMITED, f/k/a ABN AMRO Fund Services
(Isle of Man) Nominees, and f/k/a Fortis (Isle
of Man) Nominees Limited, and PLATINUM
ALL WEATHER FUND LIMITED,

Defendants.

Adv. Pro. No. 08-01789 (CGM)
SIPA Liquidation
(Substantively Consolidated)

Adv. Pro. No. 12-01697 (CGM)

**NOTICE OF JOINDER IN OBJECTING DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO
TRUSTEE'S MOTION FOR ORDER AMENDING ORDER APPOINTING A
DISCOVERY ARBITRATOR PURSUANT TO BANKRUPTCY RULE 9019(c) AND
GENERAL ORDER M-390**

Defendant ABN AMRO Retained Nominees (IOM) Limited, f/k/a ABN AMRO Fund Services (Isle of Man) Nominees Limited, and f/k/a Fortis (Isle of Man) Nominees Limited (“IOM Nominees”), hereby objects to the Motion for Order Amending Order Appointing a Discovery Arbitrator Pursuant to Bankruptcy Rule 9019(c) and General Order M-390, filed in Adv. Pro. No. 08-01789 (CGM), ECF 23449, 23454 (“Trustee’s Motion”), by Irving H. Picard, as trustee for the liquidation of Bernard L. Madoff Investment Securities LLC and the estate of Bernard L. Madoff (“Trustee”), and joins in all aspects of the Opposition to the Trustee’s Motion, ECF No. 23516, filed by Objecting Defendants, except for ¶¶ 8, 19 (third sentence), 32-38 and the final sentence of the Conclusion paragraph.

IOM Nominees is a party to one of the adversary proceedings, referred to by the Trustee as the Subsequent Transfer Cases, in which a Case Management Plan has not yet been entered, and as such, the fallback position advocated by Objecting Defendants in their Opposition – that, at a minimum, the Court deny the Trustee’s Motion only with respect to adversary proceedings with previously entered Case Management Plans that (1) provide for mandatory discovery arbitration and (2) cite the existing Order Appointing Discovery Arbitrator – would not be adequate to protect the rights of the IOM Nominees, which are in all other relevant respects identically situated to Objecting Defendants.

Because the Trustee has failed to justify the modification to the Order Appointing Discovery Arbitrator he seeks, under either Rule 60(b)(5) or Rule 60(b)(6), the Trustee’s Motion should be denied in its entirety as to all defendants who are parties to the Subsequent Transfer cases.

Dated: September 6, 2023
New York, New York

Respectfully submitted,

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP

By:

/s/ Christopher R. Harris

Christopher R. Harris
Thomas J. Giblin
1271 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020
Telephone: (212) 906-1200
Facsimile: (212) 751-4864
Email: christopher.harris@lw.com
Email: thomas.giblin@lw.com

Attorneys for IOM Nominees